

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/601,222

Applicant(s)

COULIER ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher J. Brown

Art Unit

2134

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher J. Brown.

(3) James LaBarre.

(2) Weiwei Y. Stiltner.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 18 January 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Proust US 6,216,014 Barkley US 6,202,066.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant explained to examiner that claim 1 referred to the allocation of registers rather than allocation of rights to directories. Applicant also argued that the directories in an n-level tree in Proust were not storing applications, but rather data. Examiner agreed that modification of claim 1 to clearly indicate allocation of registers would overcome the Barkley reference. Examiner agreed to search through Proust more thoroughly regarding the n-level tree. Examiner expressed interest in limitations including smartcards, less registers than directories, and detailed definitions regarding the security registers that would further limit the claim as to require further search.

Chris Brown
1/18/07